DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 294 FL 019 132

AUTHOR Slavin, Robert E.; Yampolsky, Renee
TITLE Success for All: Effects on Language Minority Students.
INSTITUTION Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, Baltimore, MD.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO 14
PUB DATE Mar 91
CONTRACT R117R9002
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Asian Americans; *Basic Skills; Cambodians; Comparative Analysis; English (Second Language); Immigrants; *Limited English Speaking; Primary Education; Program Effectiveness; Reading Achievement
IDENTIFIERS Philadelphia School District PA; Success for All Program

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of two years (1988-1990) of the Success for All elementary school restructuring program in grades K-3 at the Francis Scott Key Elementary School (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania). The program was designed to ensure basic skills education for the majority Asian population of the school. The program uses innovative reading programs, one-to-one tutoring from certified teachers, frequent assessment, family support services, and other interventions to assure initial and continued student success. This is the first instance in which the program design was implemented among children whose home language was not English. Results of the first 2 years confirm a pattern seen in other Success for All schools. The effects are strongest for students who begin their reading instruction in the program. Comparison of participants' reading achievement with that of children in a control school show the Francis Scott Key Asian students to be performing substantially better than control school students in kindergarten, first, and second grades. Additional research is recommended to determine whether the Asian students are doing as well as African American students in other Success for All schools. A 12-item bibliography and data tables showing student results are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED331294

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Federally funded

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL019132

CDS

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

SUCCESS FOR ALL

Effects on Language Minority Students

Robert E. Slavin
Renee Yampolsky

Report No. 14

March 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

National Advisory Panel

Beatriz Arias, College of Education, Arizona State University

Mary Frances Berry, Department of History, University of Pennsylvania

Anthony S. Bryk, Department of Education, University of Chicago

Michael Charleston, Educational Policy Studies, Pennsylvania State University

Constance E. Clayton, Superintendent, Philadelphia Public Schools

Edmund Gordon (Chair), Department of Psychology, Yale University

Ronald D. Henderson, National Education Association

Vinetta Jones, Dean, Education and Urban Affairs, Morgan State University

Arturo Madrid, Director, Tomas Rivera Center

Hernan LaFontaine, Superintendent, Hartford Public Schools

Peter Stanley, Director, Education and Culture Program, Ford Foundation

William Julius Wilson, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago

Center Liaison

Harold Himmelfarb, Office of Educational Research and Improvement

SUCCESS FOR ALL

Effects on Language Minority Students

Robert E. Slavin

Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students

Renee Yampolsky

Philadelphia Public Schools

Grant No. R117 R90002

Report No. 14

March 1991

Published by the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, supported as a national research and development center by funds from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the OERI, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students
The Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

The Center

The mission of the Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students (CDS) is to significantly improve the education of disadvantaged students at each level of schooling through new knowledge and practices produced by thorough scientific study and evaluation. The Center conducts its research in four program areas: The Early and Elementary Education Program, The Middle Grades and High Schools Program, the Language Minority Program, and the School, Family, and Community Connections Program.

The Early and Elementary Education Program

This program is working to develop, evaluate, and disseminate instructional programs capable of bringing disadvantaged students to high levels of achievement, particularly in the fundamental areas of reading, writing, and mathematics. The goal is to expand the range of effective alternatives which schools may use under Chapter 1 and other compensatory education funding and to study issues of direct relevance to federal, state, and local policy on education of disadvantaged students.

The Middle Grades and High Schools Program

This program is conducting research syntheses, survey analyses, and field studies in middle and high schools. The three types of projects move from basic research to useful practice. Syntheses compile and analyze existing knowledge about effective education of disadvantaged students. Survey analyses identify and describe current programs, practices, and trends in middle and high schools, and allow studies of their effects. Field studies are conducted in collaboration with school staffs to develop and evaluate effective programs and practices.

The Language Minority Program

This program represents a collaborative effort. The University of California at Santa Barbara is focusing on the education of Mexican-American students in California and Texas; studies of dropout among children of recent immigrants are being conducted in San Diego and Miami by Johns Hopkins, and evaluations of learning strategies in schools serving Navajo, Cherokee, and Lumbee Indians are being conducted by the University of Northern Arizona. The goal of the program is to identify, develop, and evaluate effective programs for disadvantaged Hispanic, American Indian, Southeast Asian, and other language minority children.

The School, Family, and Community Connections Program

This program is focusing on the key connections between schools and families and between schools and communities to build better educational programs for disadvantaged children and youth. Initial work is seeking to provide a research base concerning the most effective ways for schools to interact with and assist parents of disadvantaged students and interact with the community to produce effective community involvement.

Abstract

This study reports the results of two years of implementation of the Success for All elementary school restructuring program in grades K-3 of the Francis Scott Key Elementary School. In the 1988-89 school year, 52% of the students were from Asian backgrounds, primarily Cambodian. In 1989-90, this proportion had risen to 60%. Almost all these children enter the school in kindergarten speaking little or no English and little or no English is spoken in their homes.

First-year results of Success for All on reading achievement at Key were impressive but remained tentative because a control school used for comparisons was not well matched. Second-year results, reported here, are based on comparisons of Key children's achievement with the achievement of children in a more appropriate control school. The results show that the reading performance of Asian students at Key was substantially higher than control students' performance in kindergarten, first, and second grade.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Lionel Lauer, Jim Ayres, Vicky Celotto, Saul Grossman, Mary Leighton, Rene Dahl, and the staff and students of Francis Scott Key Elementary School for their assistance with this research.

Introduction

Success for All is a program designed to ensure that every child who enters school, regardless of home background, will succeed in basic skills in the early grades and then maintain that success through the elementary years. The program uses innovative kindergarten and grade 1-3 reading programs, one-to-one tutoring from certified teachers for students who are having difficulties in reading, frequent assessment, family support services, and other interventions to try to make sure that students begin with success and remain successful through the early grades. Studies of Success for All have found substantial positive effects of the program on student reading achievement and reduced retentions and special education referrals in schools primarily serving disadvantaged African American students (Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1990; Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Livermon, & Dolan, 1990; Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, Wasik, Shaw, Leighton, & Mainzer, 1991).

In previous implementations of Success for All, the students involved have been from families who are usually poor, but where English is the language of the home. With such children it makes sense to make the promise that every child will read the first time they are taught, as long as effective instruction is given in the first place and is backed up by tutoring, family support services, or other resources if needed.

Yet there is one important category of students with needs that are quite different from those from disadvantaged but English speaking homes. These are students with limited English proficiency (LEP) who come from homes in which a language other than English is the principal means of communication. Many LEP children arrive in kindergarten with little or no English, and face the daunting task of learning English at the same time as they are learning the regular school curriculum.

In many schools serving LEP children, bilingual education programs are often used, in which students receive instruction in their native language in some subjects (particularly reading) while they are learning English. Research on bilingual education tends to support this approach (e.g., Willig, 1985; Wong-Fillmore & Valadez, 1985). However, there are many circumstances in which bilingual education is not feasible, such as when there are too few children speaking any one language in a given school or when there are no teachers available who speak the students' language. In such situations, LEP students are simply taught in English, with English as a second language (ESL) instruction given as a supplement. Such "immersion/ESL" programs put students in the extremely difficult position of trying to learn to read a language with which they have little facility.

The fundamental assumption of Success for All is that given appropriate instruction and adequate supplementary services, every child can learn to read in the first grade or shortly thereafter. Yet this assumption may not be valid with children who arrive in kindergarten with little or no English. How can the Success for All approach be adapted to the needs of LEP children in an immersion/ESL program and what outcomes will this have on their achievement? This is the focus of the present paper.

Implementation of Success for All

Beginning in September 1988, researchers from The Johns Hopkins University began working with the staff at Philadelphia's Francis Scott Key Elementary School to implement Success for All in grades K-3. In 1988-89, Francis Scott Key served 622 students in grades K-8. Fifty-two percent of its students were from Asian backgrounds, primarily Cambodian. In 1989-90, this proportion has risen to 60%. Nearly all of these students enter the school in kindergarten with little or no English. Some of their fathers but very few mothers speak English. The remainder of the school is divided between African American (22%) and white students (22%), with a small number of Hispanic students (4%). The school is located in an extremely impoverished neighborhood in South Philadelphia. Ninety-six percent of the students are from low-income families and qualify for free lunch.

Because of the unavailability of Cambodian-speaking teachers, Francis Scott Key uses an immersion/ESL approach with its LEP students. In fact, during 1988-89, not a single adult in the school spoke Cambodian, including the ESL teachers.

The Success for All program was implemented in a form similar to that in which it had been used in previous studies, with modifications to adapt to the needs of LEP students and of the school as a whole. The major program elements are described below.

Reading Tutors

One of the most important elements of the Success for All model is the use of tutors to promote students' success in reading. One-to-one tutoring is the most effective form of instruction known (see Slavin, Karweit, & Madden, 1989). The tutors are certified teachers with experience teaching Chapter 1, special education, and/or primary reading. Tutors work one-on-one with students who are having difficulties keeping up with their reading groups. The tutoring occurs in 20-minute sessions that are taken from an hour-long social studies period.

In general, tutors support students' success in the regular reading curriculum, rather than teaching different objectives. For example, if the regular reading teacher is working on long vowels, so does the tutor. However, tutors seek to identify learning problems and use different strategies to teach the same skills.

During daily two-hour reading/language arts periods, tutors serve as additional reading teachers to reduce class size for reading. At Francis Scott Key, there were five tutors. The four ESL teachers also taught a reading class, reducing class size from an average of about 30 during most of the day to about 15 during reading time. Reading teachers and tutors use brief forms to communicate about students' specific problems and needs and meet at regular times to coordinate their approaches with individual children.

Initial decisions about reading group placement and the need for tutoring are based on informal reading inventories that the tutors give to each child. Subsequent reading group placements and tutoring assignments are made based on eight-week assessments, which include teacher judgments as well as more formal assessments. First graders receive first priority for tutoring, on the assumption that the primary function of the tutors is to help all students be successful in reading the first time, before they become remedial readers.

Reading Program

Students in grades 1-3 are regrouped for reading. At Francis Scott Key, the students were assigned to heterogeneous, age-grouped classes with class sizes of about 30 most of the day. During a regular two hour reading/language arts period they were regrouped according to reading performance levels into reading classes of 15 students all at the same level. For example, a 2-1 reading/language arts class might contain first, second, and third grade students all reading at the same level.

Regrouping allows teachers to teach the whole reading class without having to break the class into reading groups. This greatly reduces the time spent in seatwork and increases direct instruction time. We do not expect reduction in class size to increase reading achievement by itself (see Slavin, 1989), but it does enable every reading class to be conducted at only one reading level, and the teacher can teach to students at the same level. This eliminates workbooks, dittos, or other follow-up activities which are needed in classes that have multiple reading groups. The regrouping is a form of the Joplin Plan, which

has been found to increase reading achievement in the elementary grades (Slavin, 1987a).

The reading program itself (Madden, Slavin, Livermon, Karweit, & Stevens, 1987) takes full advantage of having substantial amounts of time available for direct instruction (because there is only one reading group in each class). Reading teachers at every grade level begin the reading time by reading children's literature to students and engaging them in a discussion of the story to enhance their understanding of the story, listening and speaking vocabulary, and knowledge of story structure.

In kindergarten and first grade, the program emphasizes development of basic language skills with the use of Story Telling and Retelling (STaR) (Karweit, 1988), which involves the students in listening to, retelling, and dramatizing children's literature. Big books as well as oral and written composing activities allow students to develop concepts of print as they also develop knowledge of story structure. Peabody Language Development kits are used to further develop receptive and expressive language.

Beginning reading is introduced in the second semester of kindergarten. In this program, letters and sounds are introduced in an active, engaging series of activities that begins with oral language and moves into written symbols. Once letter sounds are taught, they are reinforced by the reading of stories which use the sounds. The K-1 reading program uses a series of phonetically regular but interesting minibooks and emphasizes repeated oral reading to partners as well as to the teacher, instruction in story structure and specific comprehension skills, and integration of reading and writing.

When students reach the primer reading level, they use a form of Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) (Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, 1987) with the district's Macmillan basal series. CIRC uses cooperative learning activities built around story structure, prediction, summarization, vocabulary building, decoding practice, and story-related writing. Students engage in partner reading and structured discussion of the basal stories, and work toward mastery of the vocabulary and content of the story in teams. Story-related writing is also shared within teams.

In addition to these basal story-related activities, teachers provide direct instruction in reading comprehension skills, and students practice these skills in their teams. Classroom libraries of trade books at students' reading levels are provided for each teacher, and students read books of their choice for homework for 20 minutes each night. Home readings are shared via presentations, summaries, puppet shows, and other formats twice a week during "book club" sessions.

Research on CIRC has found it to significantly increase students' reading comprehension and language skills (Stevens et al., 1987).

Eight-Week Reading Assessments

At eight week intervals, reading teachers assess how students are progressing through the reading program. The results of the assessments are used to determine who is to receive tutoring, to change students' reading groups, to suggest other adaptations in students' programs, and to identify students who need other types of assistance, such as family interventions or screening for vision and hearing problems.

Francis Scott Key Kindergarten

Francis Scott Key Elementary provides a kindergarten program that focuses on providing a balanced and developmentally appropriate learning experience for young children. The curriculum emphasizes the development and use of language. It provides a balance of academic readiness and non-academic music, art, and movement activities. Readiness activities include use of the Peabody Language Development Kits and Story Telling and Retelling (STaR). Prereading activities begin during the second semester of kindergarten.

At Francis Scott Key, a special addition was made to the usual form of the Success for All program. This was a tutoring program in which older students worked for forty-five minutes two days per week tutoring kindergarten students. Seventh and eighth graders were involved in this program in 1988-89, but grades 6-8 were moved to a middle school in 1989-90 and fifth graders became the tutors. All kindergartners received and benefitted from tutoring, but there was a particular benefit for the Cambodian students, who were assigned to Cambodian tutors. The tutors read to and with their tutees in English, translating when necessary. Over the course of the year, the discussions developed from being primarily Cambodian to primarily English.

In a school lacking Cambodian-speaking adults, the older students provided the Cambodian kindergartners with their only opportunity to use their primary language in an instructional context. This was particularly important early in the year,

when the Cambodian kindergartners arrived with little or no English.

Program Facilitator

A program facilitator works at Francis Scott Key half-time to oversee (with the principal) the operation of the Success for All model. The facilitator helps plan the Success for All program, helps the principal with scheduling, and visits classes and tutoring sessions frequently to help teachers and tutors with individual problems. She works directly with the teachers on implementation of the curriculum, classroom management, and other issues, and helps teachers and tutors deal with any behavior problems or other special problems.

Teachers and Teacher Training

The teachers and tutors are regular Philadelphia Public Schools teachers. They received detailed teacher's manuals supplemented by two days of inservice at the beginning of the school year. For teachers of grades 1-3 and for reading tutors, these training sessions focused on implementation of the reading program, and their detailed teachers' manuals covered general teaching strategies as well as specific lessons.

Kindergarten teachers and aides were trained in use of the STaR and Peabody programs, thematic units, and other aspects of the kindergarten model. Tutors later received an additional day of training on tutoring strategies and reading assessment.

Throughout the year, inservice presentations covered such topics as classroom management, instructional pace, and cooperative learning, and the facilitator and Johns Hopkins staff organized many informal sessions to allow teachers to share problems and problem solutions, suggest changes, and discuss individual children. The staff development model used in Success for All emphasizes relatively brief initial training with extensive classroom followup and coaching and group discussion.

English as a Second Language

Students identified as limited English proficient (LEP) participated in the Success for All reading and language arts program (in English) along with their English-dominant classmates during a common period in the morning. However, these students also received separate ESL instruction in the afternoon. Students identified as beginning in English received two 45-minute periods of ESL each day, while intermediate and advanced students received one period. This is less time than the usual district program which provides three, two, and one period of ESL to beginning, intermediate, and advanced students, respectively.

The instruction provided in ESL was also quite different from that given in the district as a whole. At Francis Scott Key, the focus of the ESL program was on supporting students' success in the regular reading program. The ESL teachers used the materials and techniques of the Success for All reading program to help students with specific difficulties.

With the younger children, there was an emphasis on the program elements used in Success for All to enhance the language development of all students, such as use of the Peabody Language Development Kits, Story Telling and Retelling (STaR), listening comprehension activities, and (with older students) activities involving identification of characters, settings, problems, and problem solutions in narratives, story summaries, and reading comprehension instruction. The program philosophy emphasized the importance of providing LEP students with help on the specific activities that constitute success in the regular school program, particularly reading activities.

Methods

Evaluation Design

The program at Francis Scott Key was evaluated in comparison to a similar Philadelphia elementary school. In 1988-89, a control school near Key was used, but this school turned out to have too small a population of Asian students to allow for meaningful comparisons. As a result, a different school with a large proportion of Asian students was located to serve as a control school in 1989-90. Table 1 compares the two schools on several variables taken from 1988-89 district data. As the Table shows, the two schools were very similar in overall achievement level and other variables. Forty-two percent of the comparison school's students were Asian (mostly Cambodian), the highest proportion in the city after Key. The percentage of students receiving free lunch was very high in both schools, though higher at Key (96%) than at the comparison

school (84%). A few differences are worthy of note, however. The comparison school was larger than Key, with 1,128 students overall and 541 students in grades K-3 to Key's 622 and 365. Also, the non-Asian students at Key are divided between African American and white, while those in the comparison school were almost all African American.

Measures

At Francis Scott Key and its comparison school, all students in grades K-3 were given individually administered tests in Spring 1990. The testers were undergraduates from a local university. The measures were as follows.

1. Kindergarten measures. In kindergarten, all students were individually administered four scales assessing language development and pre-reading skills: the Woodcock Letter-Word Identification scale, the Merrill Language Screening Test's Comprehension scale, Peabody Picture Vocabulary scale, and the Test of Language Development (TOLD) Sentence Imitation scale.

2. Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery (Woodcock, 1984). Two Woodcock scales, Letter-Word Identification and Word Attack, were individually administered to students in grades K-3. The Letter-Word scale was used to assess recognition of letters and common sight words, while the Word Attack scale assessed phonetic synthesis skills.

3. Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty (Durrell and Catterson, 1980). Two Durrell scales, Oral and Silent Reading, were administered to students in grades 1-3. Oral Reading presents a series of graded reading passages followed by comprehension questions, which students read aloud. The Silent Reading scale also uses graded reading passages which students read silently. Students are then asked to recall the main elements of the story. Both Oral and Silent Reading contain assessments of reading comprehension, but the Oral Reading scale has more of a decoding focus while Silent Reading has more of a comprehension focus.

4. IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT). The IPT is a test of English language proficiency administered to all Asian students. The test yields six levels of proficiency based on students' abilities to understand and use English, follow directions, use correct grammatical constructions, and so on.

Analyses

Data were analyzed using simple analyses of variance. Outcomes were characterized in terms of effect sizes, which are the differences between experimental and control means divided by the control group's standard deviations.

Results

Kindergarten

At the kindergarten level, both Asian and non-Asian students at Key scored substantially higher on a variety of language and pre-reading measures than did their control counterparts. These results are shown in Tables 2 and 3. For Asian students, differences were statistically significant on IDEA (language proficiency) and on all reading measures except the Woodcock Letter-Word scale. Effects on the Peabody were statistically significant for Non-Asians and were marginally significant ($p < .10$) on the Woodcock Letter-Word and Merrill scales.

Tables 2 and 3 Here

First Grade

First grade results for Asian students were substantially better at Key than at the comparison school (Table 4). On average, Key students performed at a grade equivalent of 1.8, nearly at grade level. Asian students in the comparison school were essentially non-readers (GE = 1.1). Effects on all reading measures were statistically significant; the effect size of +1.65 is one of the largest ever found in studies of Success for All. Positive but non-significant effects were also found for the the language proficiency measure. Non-Asians at Key also performed somewhat better than non-Asians in the comparison group (Table 5), but only the Durrell Oral effect was marginally significant.

Tables 4 and 5 Here

Second Grade

As at the first grade level, the reading performance of Asian second graders at Key was far higher than that of their counterparts in the

comparison school (ES = +1.00). Asian students at Key were below grade level expectations (GE = 2.4), but were still substantially higher than Asian second graders in the control school (GE = 1.8). Differences were statistically significant on all reading measures. Significant positive effects on language proficiency were also seen (Table 6). For non-Asians, however, there were no differences between the two schools (Table 7).

Table 6 and 7 Here

Third Grade

At the third grade level, there were no significant differences between Key and control Asian students (Table 8), and differences in the third grade on the Woodcock scales favored the comparison school (Table 9).

Tables 8 and 9 Here

Discussion

The results of the two-year evaluation of Success for All at Francis Scott Key Elementary School confirm a pattern seen in other Success for All schools (see Madden et al., 1991). First, the effects are typically strongest for the students who began their reading instruction in the program. At Key, kindergartners and first graders had their first exposure to reading instruction in Success for All, and are performing substantially better than their counterparts. Smaller effects are typically seen for students who started Success for All after a year or more of traditional instruction. As the students move through the grades, they increase their advantage over students in traditional classes. For example, at Baltimore's Abbottston Elementary School, which has completed three years of implementation, second graders (in the program since kindergarten) scored at grade level (GE = 2.9) in spring, 1990, eight months ahead of their control group; third graders were also nearly at grade level (GE = 3.8), also eight months ahead of students in the control group. A similar progression is beginning at Key school as the students who began in kindergarten and first grade are achieving and maintaining success in reading.

The second finding typical of Success for All and seen at Key is that the effects of the program are greatest for the lowest achievers. In other Success for All schools these are students who score in the lowest 25% on pretests, but at Key and its comparison school these are the Asian students, who start their schooling with little or no English. These students benefit in particular from the tutoring and family support services of Success for All. In particular, the use of the ESL program at Key to support students' success in reading clearly paid off in reading skills as well as in English language proficiency.

Clearly, there is still more to do at Key School. The program for non-Asian students needs to be reviewed to see that these students make the gains typically seen for African American and white students in other Success for All schools. Several problems were experienced in implementing the program in third grades, and these are being addressed at present.

However, the overall pattern of results at Key gives reason for considerable optimism. The younger students are coming up with solid skills in reading, the foundation for success in school. The Success for All implementation at Key School appears to be showing that within the context of an immersion/ESL approach, integrating ESL services and staff with the beginning reading program can pay off in both reading and language proficiency for LEP students. There is still a long way to go to achieve the program's goal of success for <u>every</u> child, but the results as of the end of the second year show that the implementation of Success for All at Key School is headed in the right direction.

References

Durrell, D., & Catterson, J. (1980). Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

Karweit, N.L. (1988). Story Telling and Retelling (STaR): Teacher's manual. The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., Wasik, B.A., Shaw, A., Leighton, M., and Mainzer, K.L. (1991, April). Success for all: Multi-year effects of a schoolwide elementary restructuring program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., Livermon, B.J., Karweit, N.L., & Stevens, R.J. (1987). Success for All: Teacher's manual for reading. The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Slavin, R.E. (1987). Ability grouping and student achievement in elementary schools: A best-evidence syntheses. Review of Educational Research, 57, 293-336.

Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., & Madden, N.A. (eds.) (1989). Effective programs for students at risk. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B.A. (1990). Success for All: Effects of variations in duration and resources of a schoolwide elementary restructuring program. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students, The Johns Hopkins University.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Livermon, B.J., & Dolan, L. (1990). Success for All: First-year outcomes of a comprehensive plan for reforming urban education. American Educational Research Journal, 27, 255-278.

Stevens, R.J., Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., & Farnish, A.M. (1987). Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition: Two field experiments. Reading Research Quarterly, 22, 433-454.

Willig, A.C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. Review of Educational Research, 55, 269-317.

Wong-Fillmore, L., & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Woodcock, R. W. (1984). Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery. Allen, TX: DLM.

Table 1

Characteristics of Francis Scott Key and Comparison School

Characteristics	Key	Comparison
School Enrollment, K-8	622	1,128
School Enrollment, K-3	365	541
Ethnic Composition, K-3		
Asian	55%	42%
White	21%	1%
African American	21%	55%
Hispanic	4%	2%
Percent ESL, 1-3	28%	24%
National Percentile — Reading, Spring 1988		
K	42	52
1	37	34
2	17	26
3	33	27
Average Daily Attendance	90%	91%
Percent Free Lunch	96%	84%

Table 2

Effects of Success for All
Kindergarten: Asian Students

Test		SFA (N = 56)	Control (N = 23)	Effect Size	P≤
Woodcock Letter-Word	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	6.29 (3.20)	5.83 (2.82)	+.46	ns
Merrill Comprehension	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	1.96 (1.55)	0.91 (1.16)	+.91	.01
Peabody Picture Vocabulary	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	7.27 (4.60)	4.87 (3.99)	+.60	.05
TOLD Sentence Imitation	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	3.82 (2.78)	2.35 (2.04)	+.73	.01
Language Proficiency (IDEA)	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	2.32 (0.74)	1.90 (0.54)	+.77	.01

Table 3

Effects of Success for All
Kindergarten: Non-Asian Students

Test		SFA (N = 41)	Control (N = 35)	Effect Size	P≤
Woodcock Letter-Word	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	7.15 (4.01)	5.89 (2.36)	+.53	.10
Merrill Comprehension	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	3.81 (1.42)	3.26 (1.44)	+.38	.10
Peabody Picture Vocabulary	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	12.42 (4.81)	9.37 (4.85)	+.63	.01
TOLD Sentence Imitation	$\bar{x}$ (SD)	10.83 (7.11)	9.20 (5.78)	+.28	ns

Table 4

Effects of Success for All
Grade 1: Asian Students

Test		SFA (N = 39)	Control (N = 54)	Effect Size	P≤
Woodcock Letter-Word	$\bar{x}$	17.87	11.37	+1.32	.001
	(SD)	(7.26)	(4.92)		
	GE	1.6	1.1		
Woodcock Word Attack	$\bar{x}$	5.51	0.98	+2.21	.001
	(SD)	(4.64)	(2.05)		
	GE	2.1	1.3		
Durrell Oral	$\bar{x}$	5.44	1.27	+1.71	.001
	(SD)	(4.76)	(2.44)		
	GE	1.8	1.1		
Durrell Silent	$\bar{x}$	3.45	0.84	+1.36	.001
	(SD)	(3.51)	(1.92)		
	GE	1.5	1.0		
Mean Reading Achievement	(GE)	1.8	1.1	+1.65	
Language Proficiency (IDEA)	$\bar{x}$	3.27	2.84	+.35	ns
	(SD)	(1.52)	(1.23)		

Table 5

Effects of Success for All
Grade 1: Non-Asian Students

Test		SFA (N = 16)	Control (N = 84)	Effect Size	P≤
Woodcock Letter-Word	$\bar{X}$	19.56	17.88	+.27	ns
	(SD)	(4.47)	(6.32)		
	GE	1.6	1.5		
Woodcock Word Attack	$\bar{X}$	6.13	4.55	+.36	.10
	(SD)	(2.94)	(4.37)		
	GE	2.2	2.0		
Durrell Oral	$\bar{X}$	5.08	4.68	+.10	ns
	(SD)	(3.79)	(4.21)		
	GE	1.8	1.7		
Durrell Silent	$\bar{X}$	4.77	3.56	+.32	ns
	(SD)	(3.48)	(3.76)		
	GE	1.7	1.5		
Mean Reading Achievement	(GE)	1.8	1.7	+.26	

Table 6

Effects of Success for All
Grade 2: Asian Students

Test		SFA (N = 65)	Control (N = 51)	Effect Size	P≤
Woodcock Letter-Word	$\bar{X}$	25.63	19.82	+1.08	.001
	(SD)	(5.56)	(5.38)		
	GE	2.3	1.6		
Woodcock Word Attack	$\bar{X}$	8.14	3.35	+1.22	.001
	(SD)	(5.94)	(3.94)		
	GE	2.4	1.8		
Durrell Oral	$\bar{X}$	11.00	7.05	+1.00	.001
	(SD)	(5.10)	(3.94)		
	GE	2.8	2.1		
Durrell Silent	$\bar{X}$	7.79	4.87	+.71	.001
	(SD)	(4.49)	(4.11)		
	GE	2.2	1.7		
Mean Reading Achievement	(GE)	2.4	1.8	+1.00	
Language Proficiency (IDEA)	$\bar{X}$	4.21	3.26	+.83	.001
	(SD)	(1.47)	(1.14)		

Table 7

Effects of Success for All
Grade 2: Non-Asian Students

Test		SFA (N = 43)	Control (N = 84)	Effect Size	P≤
Woodcock Letter-Word	$\bar{X}$	25.14	23.86	+.20	ns
	(SD)	(5.16)	(6.31)		
	GE	2.2	2.1		
Woodcock Word Attack	$\bar{X}$	8.95	7.95	+.19	ns
	(SD)	(5.61)	(5.20)		
	GE	2.4	2.3		
Durrell Oral	$\bar{X}$	10.52	10.48	+.01	ns
	(SD)	(5.42)	(5.94)		
	GE	2.7	2.7		
Durrell Silent	$\bar{X}$	7.58	8.71	-.20	ns
	(SD)	(4.89)	(5.71)		
	GE	2.2	2.4		
Mean Reading Achievement	(GE)	2.4	2.4	+.05	

Table 8

Effects of Success for All
Grade 3: Asian Students

Test		SFA (N = 46)	Control (N = 59)	Effect Size	P≤
Woodcock Letter-Word	$\bar{X}$	24.94	27.12	-.35	.10
	(SD)	(7.10)	(6.19)		
	GE	2.2	2.5		
Woodcock Word Attack	$\bar{X}$	8.39	8.42	-.01	ns
	(SD)	(7.03)	(5.63)		
	GE	2.4	2.4		
Durrell Oral	$\bar{X}$	13.92	11.95	+.42	.10
	(SD)	(7.36)	(4.73)		
	GE	3.3	2.9		
Durrell Silent	$\bar{X}$	10.55	9.44	+.22	ns
	(SD)	(6.23)	(5.11)		
	GE	2.7	2.5		
Mean Reading Achievement	(GE)	2.7	2.6	+.07	
Language Proficiency (IDEA)	$\bar{X}$	4.66	4.76	-.07	ns
	(SD)	(1.63)	(1.56)		

Table 9

Effects of Success for All
Grade 3: Non-Asian Students

Test		SFA (N = 25)	Control (N = 86)	Effect Size	P≤
Woodcock Letter-Word	$\bar{x}$	26.56	29.98	-.60	.05
	(SD)	(7.36)	(5.73)		
	GE	2.7	3.1		
Woodcock Word Attack	$\bar{x}$	9.24	12.28	-.50	.05
	(SD)	(5.77)	(6.14)		
	GE	2.9	3.4		
Durrell Oral	$\bar{x}$	14.69	15.52	-.13	ns
	(SD)	(7.58)	(6.19)		
	GE	3.4	3.5		
Durrell Silent	$\bar{x}$	10.76	12.95	-.31	ns
	(SD)	(6.56)	(10.76)		
	GE	2.7	3.1		
Mean Reading Achievement	(GE)	2.9	3.3	-.38	